

### **Remarks**

In response to the Office Action mailed on March 29, 2007, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1, 5, 7, 9, and 13 have been amended and claims 3 and 11 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The claims have been amended to clarify that accepting a user selection further comprises accepting, for analysis, a user designation of a subset of varying link levels away from the hypertext document to be analyzed from among a set of links comprising a plurality of varying link levels away from the hypertext document. Support for this amendment may be found in canceled claims 3 and 11 and on page 13, lines 12-29 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-15, 17-19, and 21-24 are pending in the application. In the Office Action, claims 1-15, 17-19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Weinberg et al. (US 6,549,944, hereinafter “Weinberg”). Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg in view of Dutta et al. (US 7,162,526, hereinafter “Dutta”).

### **Applicant's Statement of the Substance of the Interview**

A brief telephonic interview between the undersigned representative for the Applicant and the Examiner was held on May 9, 2007 on to discuss proposed amendments to the independent claims in view of the cited reference Weinberg. In the interview, the Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed clarifying the claims with additional details from the Specification with respect to the analysis of a user defined number of “link levels” away from the hypertext document undergoing analysis, to overcome the Weinberg reference.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-15, 17-19, 21, and 22 are rejected as being anticipated by Weinberg. As discussed above, claims 3 and 11 have been canceled thus rendering the rejection of these claims as moot. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a computer-executable method of testing a hypertext document for compliance with a selected criterion. The method includes accepting a user selection of the selected criterion and user input of at least one parameter indicative of compliance with the selected criterion for an analysis of the hypertext document, wherein accepting a user selection further comprises accepting, for analysis, a user designation of a subset of varying link levels away from the hypertext document to be analyzed from among a set of links comprising a plurality of varying link levels away from the hypertext document; performing the analysis of the hypertext document and generating analysis data, the analysis data comprising an indication of whether the hypertext document is in compliance with the selected criterion; correcting a definable error by presenting the analysis data to an application program; storing the analysis data and the link information for the hypertext document; and presenting at least a portion of the analysis data to the user; wherein the selected criterion involves at least one of the following: finding offensive material; a name change; and finding copyright violations.

It is respectfully submitted that Weinberg fails to teach each and every feature specified in amended claim 1. For example, Weinberg fails to teach at least accepting, for analysis, a user designation of a subset of varying link levels away from the hypertext document to be analyzed from among a set of links comprising a plurality of varying link levels away from the hypertext document, as well as failing to teach that the selected criterion involves at least one of the following: finding offensive material; a name change; and finding copyright violations.

Weinberg discusses a test generation tool that automatically generates test scenarios for evaluating the performance of Web sites based on information stored within a server access log of accesses that have been made to a Web site over a period of time. The logs include the IP addresses of visiting users and the URLs that were accessed. The scenario generation process includes using the IP addresses within the log file to “trace” the navigation paths taken by individual users to produce a routes list having information about the number of “hits” occurring on a Web site link. A scanning thread may also be launched on a URL-by-URL basis until all of the URLs for a Web site have been scanned or until the process is halted by a user. The scenario may then be used load-test the Web site. See Col. 3, lines 1-36 and Col. 21, lines 13-32.

Weinberg however, fails to disclose the user designation, for analysis, of a subset of varying link levels away from the hypertext document to be analyzed, as specified in amended claim 1. Instead, as discussed above, Weinberg only discusses the scanning of URLs on a Web site, however the reference is silent with respect to whether the scanned URLs represent varying link levels from a hypertext document such as a Web site home page, for example. Weinberg is also silent with respect to (and thus fails to teach) a selected criterion which involves at least one of the following: finding offensive material; a name change; and finding copyright violations. In the Office Action, it is only alleged that Weinberg teaches finding and repairing broken links and finding external links (see Col. 15, line 58 through Col. 16, line 57, Col. 30, line 45 through Col. 31, line 55 and Col. 25, lines 50-65 of Weinberg). Thus, based on the foregoing, amended claim 1 is allowable over Weinberg and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 4, 15, 17, 19, 21, and 22 depend from amended claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Amended independent claims 5, 9, and 13 specify similar features as amended claim 1 and thus

are allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Claims 6-8, 10, 12, and 14 depend from amended claims 5, 9, and 13, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 23 and 24 are rejected as being unpatentable over Weinberg in view of Dutta. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Weinberg and Dutta fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claims 23 and 24. Claims 23 and 24 depend from amended claim 1 and thus recite at least the same features. As discussed above, Weinberg fails to teach each of the features specified in amended claim 1. It is further respectfully submitted that Weinberg further fails to disclose, suggest, or render obvious each of the features specified in amended claim 1, based on the discussion above. Therefore, claims 23 and 24 are allowable over Weinberg for at least the aforementioned reasons.

Dutta, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Weinberg, discusses filtering content (e.g., Web pages), based on the accessibility of the content to a user. An evaluation tool evaluates requested content for accessibility and compares the results to a user required accessibility level to determine if the content is accessible to the user. See Col. 1, lines 21-62. Dutta however, fails to teach, disclose, or suggest accepting, for analysis, a user designation of a subset of varying link levels away from the hypertext document to be analyzed from among a set of links comprising a plurality of varying link levels away from the hypertext document or that the selected criterion involves at least one of the following: finding offensive material; a name change; and finding copyright violations, as recited in claims 23 and 24.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Weinberg and Dutta fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claims 23 and 24. Therefore, claims 23 and 24 are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(404) 954-5100

Date: June 29, 2007

/Alton Hornsby III/  
Alton Hornsby III  
Reg. No. 47,299

